



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/870,591	06/06/1997	HEINZ ESCH	08594327	7151

7590 02/25/2002

CUSHMAN DARBY & CUSHMAN
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP OF PILLSBURY
MADISON & SUTRO
9TH FLOOR 1100 NEW YORK AVENUE NW
WASHINGTON, DC 200053918

EXAMINER

HENDRICKSON, STUART L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1754

DATE MAILED: 02/25/2002

42

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	870591	Applicant(s) Esh
Examiner	Denhikson	Group Art Unit 11M

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/11/02

This action is **FINAL**.

Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

Claim(s) 16-19 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

Claim(s) 16-19 is/are rejected.

Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement

Application Papers

The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is approved disapproved.

The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner

The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d).

All Some* None of the:

Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received
in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____ Interview Summary, PTO-413

Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892 Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948 Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 1754

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 18 and 19 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. As claim 16 recites an aggregate size of less than 1.5 microns, and the particle fineness must by definition be smaller since aggregates are made up of many particles, these claims appear to expand the particle size range or at best be redundant.

Claims 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Lagarde et al.

This is essentially the same rejection made in the examiner's answer (incorporated herein by reference), further noting that the intended use does not limit the product claimed. The fineness is deemed possessed since the other properties appear to be- see also column 13 middle.

Claims 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Johnson et al. '750.

This is essentially the same rejection made in the examiner's answer (incorporated herein by reference), further noting that the intended use does not limit the product claimed. The fineness is deemed possessed since the other properties appear to be; a size of 6 microns is taught.

Art Unit: 1754

Applicant's arguments filed 1/11/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Declaration is not persuasive since it is not a side-by-side comparison. The differences in the behavior in rubber could be due to some as yet unclaimed feature. There is no claim to the rubber having the unexpected properties shown. In response to the remaining arguments, it is noted that the rejections were affirmed in earlier proceedings, and the reasons for the affirmance are relied upon. The fineness is within the range taught by the references, even though the low values claimed are not explicitly recited. This is true especially in light of the rejection made under '112.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to examiner Hendrickson at telephone number (703) 308-2539.



Stuart Hendrickson
examiner Art Unit 1754